

PETERSBURG.
A BOY ARRESTED FOR BOMB-STEALING-POLITICAL MATTERS-A VOICE FROM THE TEMPERANCE MEN-THE LEGISLATIVE CONTEST-DEATH OF AN OLD CITIZEN.

(Correspondence of the Richmond Dispatch.)

This morning the police arrested a white boy, about fourteen years, named William George, on the charge of stealing a horse, valued at \$125, belonging to John Costello, a member of a gypsy band at present encamped in Prince George county. The youth has parents living in Petersburg, and left his home on Saturday night. The animal was taken last night, and was to-day found in the possession of the boy. The case goes to Prince George for examination.

Mr. Joseph E. Taylor, of Matocah district, who has been nominated for the House of Delegates by the voters of that district in Chesterfield, is a highly respectable and well-known citizen, and is much esteemed by his neighbors and all who know him. Personally no objection can be urged against him.

The following card, which evidently means business, and is strongly backed, appears in the index of this morning:

Whereas, the determination on the part of the Legislature will not pledge him to vote for the repeal of the Mottet law. Let it be understood with emphatic clearness that there are many of us who will in no case vote for any man who makes such a pledge.

It is the voice of the temperance men and churchmen.

The Benevolent Mechanic Association of this city is considering the feasibility of organizing a building association, to be known as the "Temperance Building Association," of which will be to secure homes for the poor.

Mr. Nathaniel H. Baird, an old and well-known citizen of Dinwiddie county, died two or three days ago of congestive chill.

An unusually large area throughout this section will be harvested in the fall. The farmers are hopeful, if not confident, of good prices next year, and are making preparations for a big crop.

DANVILLE.

(Correspondence of the Richmond Dispatch.)

An adjourned meeting of the Danville Conservatives was held last night, Mr. J. B. Boulton in the chair. Dr. J. H. Terry, secretary. The meeting was held to receive the report of the committee which had been appointed to notify Colonel Flournoy that he had been nominated for the Senate.

John Martin, for the committee, reported that Colonel Flournoy had replied that he felt constrained to decline accepting the nomination.

The Chair then inquired if it was the will of the meeting to accept nomination. The subject was then discussed by Mr. C. M. Boulton, Mr. J. D. Blackwell, Mr. L. C. Berkeley, Mr. J. T. Stovall, and Mr. E. M. Pace, and it was resolved that the meeting adjourn till to-night.

A public meeting was held at New Design, near the city, yesterday, at which many of the citizens of that place were present. The subject was the State and county matters.

A meeting of the Presbyterian and Baptist congregations was held at the Baptist church on Sunday night in answer to a request of a convention of the Protestant missionaries in China that the first Sunday school be observed as a day of prayer in all Protestant churches for the success of the China missions. Mr. Holmes had delivered a sermon on the subject in the morning.

At the meeting at night Mr. E. F. Acree read the appeal of the convention; addresses were delivered by Mr. J. P. Harrison, Professor J. T. Averett, and Rev. Dr. Martin, and prayer was offered by Professor S. W. Averett. The collections at the two services amounted to about \$45.

The officers for the Baptist Sunday school for the ensuing year are: J. P. Law, superintendent; E. F. Acree, assistant superintendent; R. P. Boatwright, secretary; E. R. Waddill, treasurer; T. H. Averett, librarian; W. L. Johnson, chorister; P. W. Ferry, captain of the army.

No rain yet. We commonly have frost on the 10th.

CAROLINE COUNTY.

(Correspondence of the Richmond Dispatch.)

CHILDSBURG, Va., October 9, 1877.

The rain of last Thursday was the heaviest that has fallen in this section for many years. The streams were very high, and many farmers had a part of their crop of corn and fodder carried off by the freshets. The tobacco was much damaged by the wind.

There was no slight frost, but not enough to injure any of the crops.

On Saturday night as James B. Wood, Esq., our deputy sheriff, was returning home from a neighbor's house he was struck a severe blow on the head by a club in the hands of some unseen party. The blow stunned him, and he had fainted had he not been rescued by the neighbors. He was taken to his home, and he has not yet recovered from the effects of the blow. He has had his pockets of \$200 and many valuable papers. A negro has been arrested on suspicion as the perpetrator of the outrage.

Yours truly, D. D.

The Valley of Virginia.

ILLNESS OF JUDGE RIVES-THE READJUSTERS-THE CONDEMNED MURDERERS.

(Special to the Richmond American.)

HARRISONBURG, Va., October 9.-A telegram from Judge Rives to Colonel A. S. Gray, United States marshal, states that his holding court of rheumatism will prevent his holding court here, which was to commence to-day. There is not one word of truth in the rumor that Judge Rives had an attack of paralysis. The full term of the United States Court has been indefinitely postponed.

The many sensational stories telegraphed from here to the New York Herald in reference to the readjusters are greatly magnified. To those familiar with the facts they are not worth contradicting. But as Virginia is suffering somewhat it may be proper that the sum and substance of the subject be stated as it is. There are several candidates for the Legislature who are using this hobby to ride to Richmond-on-only this and nothing more. The people of the Valley-at all events, very large majority of them-enthusiastically repudiate readjustment. You will, after the November election, hear no more of "forebore readjustment." The man Richardson, from Southwest Virginia, has written a letter to the bakers dozen of disbelievers, and stating that he is "Tenth Legion" chooses to vote for him for Lieutenant-Governor they are privileged to do so.

Silas Morris and Louisa Lawson, sentenced to be hanged October 23d and 30th for the murder of David G. Lawson, conspire to assert their innocence, and to that Governor Kemper will respect Morris until the 30th. The effort to obtain a commutation for Mrs. Lawson is not generally approved of here. The people here contend if she was man enough to commit the crime she ought to be man enough to suffer the penalty.

The post-office at Pipeps, Surry county, Va., is re-established on the route from Waverly Station to Dillard's Wharf, with William Dillard as postmaster. A new post-office is established on the route from Waverly to Gladville, with George H. Baker as postmaster.

The Hon. A. H. Stephens and Robert Toombs called at the Executive mansion Tuesday, and in consideration of Mr. Stephens' infirmities, the President came out to the carriage, and was there introduced to Mr. Toombs.

Episcopal General Convention.
From the Boston Herald.

THE QUESTION OF SUBSTITUTING THE FORM OF PRAYER.

The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, through the Rev. Dr. Benedict, of Georgia, chairman pro tem, reported resolves on the ratification of both the following proposed amendments to article 8 of the constitution:

Resolved, That the General Convention may by canon arrange and set forth a shortened form of morning and evening prayer, to be compiled wholly from the Book of Common Prayer.

Provided, however, that the General Convention shall have power, from time to time, to amend the lectionary; but no act for this purpose shall be valid which is not voted for by a majority of the whole number of bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, and a majority of the whole number of bishops entitled to representation in the House of Deputies.

The Hon. J. W. Stevenson, of Kentucky, presented a minority report. This report goes on to say that in 1871 the Convention had the matter under discussion, and that the committee on the matter reported that a constitutional amendment was necessary in the premises. It then received the decided approval of both clergy and laity. In the House of Bishops the report was adopted with a few alterations. The minority report asserts that the necessity for such a change is not becoming more and more apparent. It has been in force in England for some years, and found to be highly beneficial. The minority claim that the whole scope of the proposed amendment is to provide the adoption of a form of service which is not the "work of the living word." This portion of the committee recommended the following substitution:

Resolved, That the above amendment in constitution in section 8 be adopted.

The minority report is signed by George F. Cuyler, of New York, J. V. Howe, and J. W. Stevenson.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

The Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania, said that in 1859 an effort was made to bring the above matter to the attention of the House of Bishops. This had been done, but no response was made. He then alluded to the House of Deputies had been infringing.

The Rev. Dr. Leeds said that his objection was that the minority report was endeavoring to do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly. He said that he could not do indirectly that which they could not do directly.